profits within the State, is it not advisable to get some local people trained in such businesses ?

Third Member of Council.—

If there are any such people who are duly qualified, they may apply for scholarships.

Mr. S V. Gurumurtiacharya.—

Will Government be pleased to notify in the official Gazette that such scholarships will be awarded to intending applicants ?

Third Member of Council.—

No ; the applications must first be received.

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS.

Resolution No. 3.

That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that a committee of non-official members consisting of not less than 15 in number elected by this Assembly may be appointed to consider in detail the various aspects of the revised rules regarding the levy of toll at Provincial, District Board and Municipal Toll Gates and to give their suggestions for revising them with special reference to the following points :—

(1) increase in the number of toll gates;

(2) grant of exemption for a period of 24 hours for traffic which pays toll at any of the gates;

(3) grant of permission to all municipalities to establish toll gates.

(4) increase in the classes of traffic liable to payment of toll;

(5) increase in the rates.

Movers.—Messrs. D. S. Mallappa and M. Basavaiah, Tiptur Rural ; G. K. Mallappa, Tiptur Urban ; Abdul Nabi Khan, Tumkur Rural ; and S. Sorappa, Sira Rural.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA, in moving the above resolution, said that under a recent order of Government, 29 District Fund and 19 Provincial toll gates were opened, the main object of the order being apparently that the maintenance of the roads required more money which the Government could

not find from their ordinary revenues and that it should be found by toll gate collections. But he failed to understand whether it was sought to be made out that the roads were all right formerly and that they had deteriorated after the advent of motor buses. He pointed out that the result of the new order was that rates were levied not only on motor buses but also on bullock carts belonging to the agriculturists. He did not see why the raiyats were subjected to this additional taxation.

In the second place, constitutional procedure required that before taking a decision in the matter, the Government should have consulted the Assembly. He regretted that this was not done. After all, the total amount that could be collected from this source would not exceed a lakh of rupees, and for the sake of this paltry sum, considerable inconvenience was caused to small farmers and petty traders, in addition to enhancing the prices of commodities. The member was aware that carts belonging to villagers within a distance of 5 miles from the toll gates were exempted from payment. But the villagefolk were generally uneducated and could not know the rules properly. The toll gate contractors took full advantage of their ignorance. Further, as the people were already overtaxed in Mysore, any additional taxation of this kind should be avoided by every possible means. The member also thought that the power now given to the District Boards to establish toll gates within their jurisdiction would work as a hardship on the villagers. For these reasons he commended the resolution to the favourable consideration of the House and the Government.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA seconded the resolution and said that it was the motors and motor buses that were mainly responsible for the damage caused to the roads, and there was no reason why the country carts should pay the penalty for such damage. The real fact was that the allotment for road repairs remained the same as it was 10 years ago in spite of the Government making additional income from the raiyats by way of increased assessment, cesses and other indirect taxes, and the member doubted whether even with the additional income derived from tolls they would really pay better attention to road maintenance. He was of opinion that a better provision should be made for this work and that the D.P.W. rates for work should be suitably enhanced so as to induce the contractors to show really good work. After all, the repair of roads was the

normal business of the Government and it was not just to tax the people indirectly for that purpose. Moreover, he thought that the establishment of toll gates would result in the harassment of the people by the toll gate officials, such as the one that recently occurred between Gundlupet and Ootacamund. He doubted whether the exception made in the new Government Order regarding the 5 miles radius would be really workable in practice.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY said that the revised rules provided that exemption should be given to cartmen on their producing a certificate from the Chairman of the village Panchayet concerned.

MR. LINGE GOWDA thought that that matter should have been considered before the order was passed. People were already suffering and the establishment of Provincial toll gates side by side with the District Board toll gates would still further increase their suffering. He was of opinion that people should not be required to pay at more than one place in the course of the same journey and that tolls should be levied only on things coming into the place and not on those going out.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH in further supporting the resolution stated that even though the percentage of grants for road maintenance was already much higher in past years than at present, the Government went on levying additional taxes under different names. As improvement of traffic, yield from lands, means of communication, etc., were among the main considerations at the time of re-settlement, no toll could reasonably be collected for road maintenance specially. The deterioration of roads was due to motors and buses mainly and, if at all, the toll could only be levied from them. After all, the additional income to be derived on account of the new toll gates was about Rs. 1,00,000 and for the sake of such a small amount it was not proper to inconvenience all the raiyats and specially those using bullock carts.

THE DEWAN said that the District Boards themselves recommended the establishment of toll gates.

MR. MALLIAH replied that whereas the District Boards consisted only of the representatives of the people, the Executive Government did not. Hence he did not think that the comparison was right. In the Western countries, he said, there were no toll gates at all.

THE DEWAN observed that there, the people were made to pay in many other ways. So far as the new

Government Order was concerned, it embodied the recommendations of a committee of officials and non-officials appointed by the Government.

MR. MALLIAH replied that the non-official members of that committee thought that the levy of tolls was unjust. According to the original order, the estimated income from tolls was Rs. 1 lakh, but in accordance with the recommendations of the new committee, certain exceptions had been made and the Government Order revised. Under that order the estimated income would be very much reduced. Was it necessary, he asked, for the sake of such an insignificant sum, to harass the people by establishing new toll gates ?

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH said that after paying the toll, very little remained as profit to the poor cart-man ; nor was the position of the owner of a bus plying for hire, very much better. This was the reason why there was so much agitation against the new toll gates. After all, they brought in a small amount and it was not worth while continuing them.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the realizations from toll gates formed 20 per cent of the expenditure on road maintenance.

MR. SANJEEVIAH replied that after all, the income expected to be derived from the toll gates was very much less than the expenditure incurred on account of entertainment of State guests. He said that this amount might easily be given up by the Government, with advantage to the people.

THE DEWAN said that it was understood that the Government of India were contemplating the levy of a tax on petrol and that the same thing was proposed to be done here even without waiting for the decision of the Government of India. If this was done, it would be possible to further relax the present rules.

MR. SANJEEVIAH observed that when the District Boards first proposed to open toll gates of their own, the Government did not sanction the proposal. He did not now see any object in permitting those bodies to open gates on roads, some of which were not used even by a few carts.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that consequent on the abolition of *mohatarfa*, the District Boards had to be helped in finding a fresh source of income as a set off. Besides, when once the toll gates were opened, their abolition was a matter for the concerned Boards to discuss and resolve upon.

MR. SANJEEVIAH then contended that it was incorrect

to say that motor buses were mostly responsible for damaging the roads, and quoted facts and figures to prove the contrary. He concluded with the suggestion that instead of continuing toll gates, action should be taken to tax petrol tanks.

MR. M. S. LINGE GOWDA said that formerly, the raiyats were paying mohatarfa, grazing fees, etc., in lieu of which they were asked to pay toll gate fees. If they thought that this was a hardship and if they were now required to pay the toll every time that a conveyance passed through a gate, it was much better to re-levy the mohatarfa tax and grazing fees. He was of opinion that it was the country carts that damaged the roads and it was therefore necessary to tax them also, excepting, of course, those coming from within a radius of 5 miles.

MR. S. N. M. RAZVI said that because the Local Self-Government Conference was in favour of opening more toll gates, the several District Boards also wanted to take action in the matter. But while members supported toll gates being established by District Boards, they were opposed to the same thing when Government proposed it. He did not see any consistency in such an attitude. In the second place, he said that most of the hardships complained of were caused by the District Fund gates, and if these were abolished the raiyats would be considerably relieved. If this was agreed to by the members, it would be possible to press for the abolition of Provincial toll gates also later on. Motors and motor buses, in his opinion, deserved to be heavily taxed because in the first place they damaged the roads, and in the second, they were responsible for a large sum of money going out of the country every year on account of the cost of buses and of petrol ; but there was no justification in taxing country carts. But in all these matters, he said, the proposals must emanate from the District Boards themselves.

MR. BASAPPA SETTY observed that when the toll gates were opened, the people had expected that increased grants would be made for road maintenance. This was not done ; nor was there a guarantee that even the small allotment made at present was utilized entirely for road works, as there was no adequate supervision. In these circumstances he supported the resolution, with the remark that no country ever prospered with the aid of tolls.

MR. SIDDALINGAPPA CHETTY observed that the question rof consideration was whether all the grants allotted for road maintenance were being actually put to that use.

Whether the metal collected for use on a particular road was so utilised during the year or was allowed to lie simply till the succeeding year, had first to be verified. If this was done, he said, the needlessness of having any toll gates would become self-evident.

MR. BELUR SRINIVASA IYENGAR observed that the Government should hope to get increased revenues under Mining and some other heads, and that they should not think of paltry sources of revenue like toll gates which only caused unnecessary harassment to the poor raiyats. Besides, the people had to pay the toll once, twice or thrice according to the number and situation of the toll gates concerned, and in many cases there was a very uneven distribution of this additional burden. This was a position which required looking into at once. To a Government which spent lakhs of rupees on speculative concerns like the Bhadravati Iron Works, the one lakh of rupees expected to be derived from toll gates was nothing. This sum might as well be given up in view of the anticipated figures under Mining or any other head. For these reasons he strongly appealed to the Dewan to whole-heartedly announce in his concluding remarks that Government would be graciously pleased to abolish all toll gates.

MESSRS. VEMA REDDY and APPAJI GOWDA *alias* SIDDE GOWDA stated that ever since the toll gates were established, respectable men were subjected to insults of various sorts, and poor men to untold hardships. They had no objection to levy tolls on motor cars and buses. As regards exemption of bullock carts, they said that it was not always possible to know whether a cart was used for agricultural or for commercial purposes. For these reasons they suggested that all the toll gates should be abolished, except at the frontiers.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA said that he had received copies of the resolutions passed by many a Village Panchayet bringing to notice that the new gates were causing great trouble to the poor raiyats and requesting their total abolition. He said that road repairs must be done with the help of the various taxes that were being collected from the people and that there was no justification for a separate levy for the purpose. If a particular Committee had resolved in favour of establishing toll gates, that by itself was not binding on the Assembly as that Committee was not appointed by the Assembly. He therefore requested that the resolution should be accepted.

MR. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA pressed for the abolition of the three toll gates which were located very near each other in the Goribidnur Taluk.

MR. RANGASWAMI IYENGAR of Magadi brought to notice that the District Board toll gate on the Magadi road was located at a very inconvenient point and that even when the raiyats merely went from their houses on one side of the road to their fields on the other side, they were made to pay the toll, simply because they went in carts. He was surprised that while public servants were exempted from payment of tolls, raiyats in the above circumstances were not given the same treatment.

MR. B. ABDUR RAHMON stated that the Bangalore District Board decided to establish toll gates of their own, several months after other Ditrict Boards had taken action in that direction and after resolutions were passed unanimously and repeatedly that such gates should be opened. The Bangalore District Board also had passed a resolution that toll should be levied only once on a cart in the course of 24 hours.

MR. B. SRINIVASA IYENGAR of Anekal, while agreeing that the levy of toll was inconvenient to the people, thought that for each district there might be one toll gate at the frontier and not within the district, and that if toll gates should be allowed to be opened both by the District Board and by a Municipality, the proceeds should be distributed equally between the two bodies.

MESSRS. SIDDALINGA DEVARU, SUBBANNA NAIK, RAMADAS and several other members said that all the toll gates should be abolished and that in the meantime, all country carts should be exempted from payment of toll.

THE DEWAN replied that instead of doing away with toll gates altogether, Government might consider the question of exempting carts from the levy. In any case he said that the matter would be re-considered and suitable orders passed in due course. He added that to begin with, only one toll gate would be allowed to continue at Seringapatam, exempting country carts, and the result watched.

The members from Sira pressed for an immediate decision, and said that this was a matter of special importance to people going to that town from the surrounding villages in connection with shandies, as they had to pay the toll at least three times on one and the same day.

THE DEWAN replied that it was not possible to give a final decision immediately. Government would consider all

aspects of the matter and pass orders as soon as possible. He added, however, that he had no objection to take the resolution as having been passed unanimously.

Representations.

No. 1.—Giving a date of hearing for petitions presented in the Revenue Department as in the Judicial Department.

Mr. M. Rangaswamiengar *alias* Chokkam Iyengar, Magadi Rural

MR. RANGASWAMIENGAR brought to notice that there was considerable delay in the disposal of petitions presented in the Revenue Department whether there were takrars or not. In order to enable the parties to know what became of their petitions, he requested that officers competent to receive petitions must be asked to give a date of hearing within which they should get all necessary information, and on such dates, they should hear the parties and dispose of them.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER replied that a Circular Order would be issued to that effect to the extent possible.

No. 2.—Classification of certain wet lands as dry.

Mr. B. Venkatappa, Devanahalli Rural.

MR. VENKATAPPA prayed that assessment on lands uncultivated for non-supply of water or lying banjar for over 10 years or cultivated only with dry crops might be fixed at dry rates instead of wet, and that the Irrigation Cess should not be levied on lands irrigated by rain water or wells.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER said that if there should be any complaints in the matter, they might be submitted to him for inquiry.

THE DEWAN said that if wet assessment be levied on such lands, remission would certainly be given according to the rules.

No. 3.—Conversion of sub-taluks into pucca taluks.

Messrs. A. M. Venkatasamiah, Closepet Urban; and Veerasanjeeva Gowda, Closepet Rural.

MR. VEERASANJEEVA GOWDA represented that in accordance with the promise made by the Government about 10 years back that all the sub-taluks in the State would be converted into taluks, at least one or two sub-taluks might be converted into pucca taluks every year. He also prayed that the Closepet Sub-Taluk might be converted into a pucca taluk.